



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,387	03/31/2004	Mihai Florin Ionescu	24207-10091	5527

62296 7590 08/12/2008  
GOOGLE / FENWICK  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA ST.  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/814,387	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IONESCU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CINDY NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 31-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 31-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/16/08</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This is response to amendment filed 0707/08.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07/16/08 is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 35-36, 40-46, 49-50, 52, 53, 61-65, 68-69, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102() as being anticipated by Owens et al. (US 20070022155, hereafter Owens).

Regarding claims 1, 42 and 61 Owens discloses: a method, a computer program product and a system for capturing event data) associated with a plurality of different types of articles generated by a plurality of different client applications (see paragraph 0013, Owens), comprising:

Storing a plurality of different event schema (the desktop objects can represented in XML format, see paragraphs 0039, 0044, 0098-0108), each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles (see paragraph 0039, 0063, 0120, Owens );

Detecting an event, the event including a user interaction with an article (i.e., recognizes such an event the client 10 invokes an action handler associated with that event... see paragraph 0048);

Responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article ( see paragraph 0048, 0062. 0063, Owens); and

Storing event data identifying the event and the article using the determined event schema (see paragraphs 0044, 0083, 0105, 0106, 0117, Owens).

Regarding claims 2, 43 and 62, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses further comprising transferring the event data to a search application (i.e., sending the message with XML attachment to client with a web request message... see paragraph 0035, Owens).

Regarding claims 3, 45 and 64, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. Owens discloses further comprising accessing and providing the event data to a requester by a search application in response to a

search query submitted by the requester (i.e., the changes requested by the user are sent to the enterprise application by email message... see paragraphs 0068-0079, Owens).

Regarding claims 10, 46 and 65, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses: wherein the event further comprises user interactions with a client application or a client device to access the article (i.e., user-initiated event for contextual information about current interaction...paragraphs 0064, Owens).

Regarding claims 12, 44 and 63, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 2, 43 and 62 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses: wherein the event data is transferred using one or a combination of the following information exchange mechanisms: Extensible Markup Language-Remote Procedure Calling Protocol (XML/RPC), Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), Shared memory, sockets, local or remote procedure calling (see paragraph 0057, Owens).

Regarding claims 35, 49 and 68, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses: wherein the event schema describes the format of an event, the format comprising fields (object's properties) for at least one of event data associated with the event, an article associated with the event, or the content of the article (i.e., XML

Art Unit: 2161

format associate with each objects,... see paragraphs 0044, 0100, 0105, 0106, Owens).

Regarding claims 36, 50 and 69, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses: wherein the event is a real-time event ( see paragraphs 0117, Owens).

Regarding claims 40, 52 and 71, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses: wherein the event is a historical event, the event having occurred in the past (i.e., view the document history..., see paragraphs 0096, 0106, Owens).

Regarding claims 41, 53 and 72, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens discloses: wherein storing further comprises storing associations between related events (see paragraph 0117, Owens).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2161

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-9, 11, 31, 38, 39, 47, 48, 54—60, 66, 67 and 73-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al. (US 220070022155) in view of Belfiore et al. (US 20020059425, hereafter Belfiore).

Regarding claims 5, 55 and 74, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. However, Owens didn't disclose: discloses: wherein determining the event schema comprises accessing a registered event schema. On the other hand, Belfiore discloses: wherein determining the event schema comprises accessing a registered event schema (see paragraph 0086, 0087, Belfiore) . Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the steps for accessing a registered event schema in the system of Owens as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to enable the user to fill out data fields in web forms and documents by presenting choices from a data source listing possible values based on registration in the schema store.

Regarding claims 6, 54 and 73, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein each event schema indicates information to be captured for at least one application

adapted to access or manipulate the article associated with the event schema (see 0067, 0074, 0104, Owens).

Regarding claims 7, 56 and 75, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein the registered event schema is an extension of another registered event schema (i.e., adds new history record to the tracked history of the document... see paragraph 0106, Owens).

Regarding claims 8, 57 and 76, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein at least one registered event schema has multiple versions (see paragraph 0130, Belfiore).

Regarding claims 9, 58 and 77, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein at least one registered event schema is an extension of a predefined base event schema provided by a search application (i.e., query service 294, see paragraph 0083, 0086, Belfiore).

Regarding claims 11, 47 and 66, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition,



Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein determining an event schema comprises registering a new event (i.e., schema adapter service, see paragraph 0082, Belfiore).

Regarding claims 38, 59 and 78, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55, 74 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein the registered event schema further comprises a schema identifier, and wherein the schema identifier and schema are stored in a searchable database (see paragraph 0130, Belfiore).

Regarding claims 39, 60 and 79, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: wherein the registered event schema is configured to allow a search application to determine types of event data associated with an event (see paragraph 0048, Owens).

Regarding claims 31, 48 and 67, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Owens/Belfiore discloses: further comprising placing the event data in a queue and indexing the event data responsive to its position in the queue, the event data in the format described by one of a plurality of event schemas (i.e., message queue 250 a and 250b, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Belfiore). Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include queue and indexing the event data in the system of Owens as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to provide efficient and reliable messaging over the Internet.

Regarding claims 37, 51 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al. (US 20070022155) in view of Bates et al. (US 6873982) (hereafter Bates).

Regarding claims 37, 51, 70, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 36, 50 and 69, respectively. However, Owens didn't disclose: wherein the real-time event is selectively indexed by a search application. On the other hand, Bates discloses: wherein the real-time event is selectively indexed by a search application (i.e., the database accessed by the search engine is representative of an internet base utilized in connection with indexing... see col. 6, lines 25-50, Bates). Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include indexing the event data in the system of Owens as taught by Bates. The motivation being to process the search requests in order in staging queue and in order to generate an ordered listed of search results.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cindy Nguyen

/C. N./

Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161